

**THE DIFFERENCE ON WRITING ABILITY OF THE STUDENTS
TAUGHT BY USING COLLABORATIVE LEARNING AND
CONVENTIONAL LEARNING AT THE SECOND
YEAR OF SMP NEGERI I RAMBAH OF
ROKAN HULU REGENCY**

Thesis

Submitted to Fulfill One of the Requirements
for Degree of Bachelor in English Education



BY

ENDA ROYANI

NIM. 10714000727

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1432 H/2011 M**

**THE DIFFERENCE ON WRITING ABILITY OF THE STUDENTS
TAUGHT BY USING COLLABORATIVE LEARNING AND
CONVENTIONAL LEARNING AT THE SECOND
YEAR OF SMP NEGERI I RAMBAH OF
ROKAN HULU REGENCY**



BY

**ENDA ROYANI
NIM. 10714000727**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1432 H/2011 M**

ABSTRACT

ENDA ROYANI (2011): “The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students Taught by Using Collaborative Learning and Conventional Learning at the Second Year of SMP Negeri I Rambah of Rokan Hulu Regency”

Students’ difficulties in expressing the ideas by using writing performance on certain text have been a problem at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah. It is related to content, organization, vocabulary, Language use, and Mechanic. The researcher found that students are not able to write short functional text based on rhetorical pattern correctly.

Learning strategy determine students’ writing ability very much. In order that the purpose of teaching and the graduated standard writing can be reached, the teachers must make the efforts to reach it’s maximally. The researcher belief that through giving different learning strategy students’ writing ability will different either. In this research, the researcher will compare students’ writing ability by using two learning strategies, those, collaborative learning and conventional learning.

The subject of the research is the students at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah and the object of the research is students’ writing ability.

The design of the research is quasi-experimental research. The population of the research is students at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah. The total population of the research is four classes (111 students). The sample of the research is consists of two classes; VIII² and VIII³. Class VIII² taught by using conventional learning, whereas class VIII³ taught by using collaborative learning. They were chosen by using simple random sampling through lottery.

The technique of collecting data is test; Pre-test and Post-test. In analyzing the data the researcher used T-Test. The formula as follows:

$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Based on the researcher’s finding that the students who taught by using collaborative learning have high score than students who taught by using conventional learning. It can be seen from the percentage of students who passed the graduated standard of both classes. Students in conventional class who passed the graduated standard only 22.8% from the total students in the class, students who passed the graduated standard in collaborative learning is 100% from the total students in the class.

The result of T-test formula that $t_{table\ 5\%} < t_0 > t_{table\ 1\%}$, those, $2.01 < 9.72 > 2.68$, it means that there is a significant difference on writing ability of the students who taught by using collaborative learning and conventional learning at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah Rokan Hulu Regency.

ABSTRACT

ENDA ROYANI (2011): “Perbedaan Kemampuan Menulis Siswa yang diajar dengan Menggunakan Pembelajaran Collaborative dengan Pembelajaran Conventional pada Kelas Dua SMP Negeri I Rambah Kabupaten Rokan Hulu”

Kesulitan siswa dalam mengekspresikan ide dalam bentuk teks tulis dalam teks tertentu masih menjadi sebuah masalah pada siswa kelas dua SMP Negeri I Rambah. Kesulitan tersebut berhubungan dengan isi, susunan kata, kosa kata, penggunaan bahasa dan mekanisme. Peneliti telah menemukan bahwa siswa tidak mampu menulis teks fungsional pendek secara benar menurut langkah retorika yang semestinya.

Strategi pembelajaran sangat menentukan kemampuan menulis siswa. Agar tujuan pengajaran dan Standar Kelulusan (SKL) menulis siswa dapat tercapai, para guru harus berusaha untuk mencapainya secara maksimal. Peneliti percaya bahwa dengan memberikan strategi pembelajaran yang berbeda maka kemampuan menulis siswa juga akan berbeda pula. Dalam penelitian ini si peneliti akan membandingkan kemampuan menulis siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan dua strategi pembelajaran, yaitu pembelajaran kolaborasi dengan pembelajaran konvensional.

Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas dua SMP Negeri I Rambah dan objek penelitian ini adalah kemampuan menulis siswa. Metode penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimental semu. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa SMP Negeri I Rambah. Jumlah populasi terdiri dari empat kelas atau 111 siswa. Sample penelitian ini terdiri dari dua kelas; VIII² dan kelas VIII³. Kelas VIII² diajar dengan menggunakan pembelajaran konvensional, sementara kelas VIII³ diajar dengan menggunakan pembelajaran kolaborasi. Sample penelitian dipilih secara random sampling melalui undian (lotre).

Teknik pengumpulan data dengan menggunakan tes; pre-test dan post-test. Untuk menganalisis data, peneliti menggunakan rumus T-test. Rumusnya sebagai berikut:

$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Berdasarkan temuan penelitian bahwa siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan pembelajaran kolaborasi memiliki nilai lebih tinggi daripada siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan pembelajaran konvensional. Ini bisa dilihat dari jumlah persen siswa yang lulus dari kedua kelas. Siswa di kelas konvensional yang lulus hanya 22.8% dari jumlah siswa yang ada di kelas tersebut, siswa yang lulus di kelas kolaborasi 100% lulus semua dari jumlah siswa yang ada di kelas tersebut.

Hasil dari rumus T-test bahwa table observasi lebih besar daripada T table, yaitu $2.01 < 9.72 > 2.68$, ini berarti bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam kemampuan menulis siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan pembelajaran kolaborasi dengan pembelajaran konvensional di kelas dua SMP Negeri I Rambah.

إنذا رايناني (2011): الفرق بين القدرة على الكتابة للطلاب الذين يتعلمون بالتعليم التعاوني و التعليم التقليدي لطلبة الصف الثاني بالمدرسة الإعدادية الحكومية 1 رامباه.

المعينة
مشكلاتهم بمحتويات
لايقدر
خطواتها.
لتحقيق أهداف التدريس
منهج التدريس
الذين
التعليم التقليدي.
الإعدادية الحكومية 1
عينات هذا
2
عينات
بطريقة
تقديم
الإعدادية الحكومية 1
وآلياتها
الوظيفية القصيرة صحيحا حيث
ويقرر منهج التدريس
للمدرسين يعملوا بجهدهم .
منهجي التدريس وهما التعليم
هذا
ويتكون هذا
الآتية وهي
التعليم التقليدي بينما
العينات العشوائية
يأنصيب.
البيانات
تحليل البيانات
يالي:

$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

الذين يتعلمون
الذين يتعلمون بالتعليم التقليدي .ويمكن
هذا
لديهم
جيدة
الناجين
كلهم.
نراها
التقليدي 22.8

وهو
الذين يتعلمون بالتعليم
الإعدادية الحكومية
دليلي بين
هناك
الذين يتعلمون بالتعليم التقليدي
2 01 < 9 72 > 2 06، تبين
1

CONTENT

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

EXAMINER APPROVAL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	iii
CONTENT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLE	ix
LIST OF APPENDIX	x

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. The Backround of the Problem	1
B. The Problem	4
1. The Identification of the Problem	4
2. The Limitation of the Problem	4
3. The Formulation of the Problem.....	4
C. The Reasons for Choosing the Title.....	5
D. The Objective and Significance of the Research.....	6
1. The Objective of the Research	6
2. The Significance of the Research.....	6
E. The Definition of Terms.....	6

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. The Theoretical Framework.....	9
1. Genres of Writing.....	11
2. Types of writing performance.....	12
3. Short Functional Text	12
4. Teaching writing	14
5. The Process of Writing	15
6. Evaluating Writing.....	17
7. Collaborative Learning	18

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students Taught by Using Collaborative Learning and Conventional Learning at the Second Year of SMP Negeri I Rambah of Rokan Hulu Regency*” is written by Enda Royani, NIM. 10714000727. It is accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, Rabiul Akhir 23, 1432 H
March 28, 2011 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of the Department
of English Education

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah M.Pd.

Supervisor

Drs. M. Syafi'i S, M.Pd.

EXAMINER APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students Taught by Using Collaborative Learning and Conventional Learning at the Second Year of SMP Negeri I Rambah of Rokan Hulu Regency*” is written by Enda Royani, NIM. 10714000727. It has been approved and examined by the examination committee of undergraduate degree on May 3, 2011 M/Jumadil Awwal 29, 1432 H at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau as one of requirements for Undergraduate Degree (S.Pd.) in English Education.

Pekanbaru, Jumadil Awwal 29, 1432 H
May 3, 2011 M

Examination Committee

Chairperson

Secretary

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Examiner I

Examiner II

Drs. H. Kalayo Hasibuan, M.Ed-TESOL.

Rizki Fiprintita, M.Pd.

Dean

Faculty of Education and Teacher Training

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.

NIP. 197002221997032001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

In the name of Allah the most gracious and the most merciful

Praise only belongs to Allah almighty the lord of universe. Because of his guidance and blessing, the researcher has completed the academic requirement. Researcher says peace to Prophet Muhammad SAW.

The researcher would like to thank to Allah SWT who has blessed and given me health, kept my spirit, and given me all of my desire especially to accomplish this thesis soon.

The researcher realizes that there are many weaknesses in completing the thesis. The researcher has been improved by comments, corrections, and bright ideas from many people or readers. Therefore, the researcher would like to say thanks to them. They are:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir, the Rector of UIN SUSKA Riau, thank you for kindness and encouragement.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati M. Ag., the Dean of Education and Teacher's Training Faculty, thank you for support and motivation.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah M. Pd., the Chairperson of English Education Department, thank you for suggestion and motivation.
4. Bukhori S. Pd. I. M. Pd., the Secretary of English Education Department, thank you for suggestion, support, and kindness.

5. Drs. M. Syafi'i S. M. Pd., my supervisor, thank you for suggestion, motivation, and support.
6. Jonri Kasdi S. Pd. I., thank you for suggestion and motivation.
7. All of lecturers, who have taught me from the beginning of the study until the end, thank you very much.
8. Ismail, S. Pd., the Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah, thank you for kindness.
9. Yuleson S. Pd and Hj. Wenri Muharyati S. Pd who have given me easiness in conducting the research, all of teachers in SMP Negeri I Rambah, thank you very much. All of the second grade students of SMP Negeri I Rambah especially students in class VIII³, thank you very much.
10. Khodijah and Bahar, my beloved parents, thank you for your love, praying, and all of you given me. I always love you until the end of my life. I really hope that. Aamiin.
11. Arisman A. Md. and Susilawati S. Pd., Arif Sudarsono S. Sos. and Eli Murni S. T (my uncles and aunts), thank you for motivation, suggestion, and everything you have given me.

The researcher is aware that the thesis is not perfect. Therefore, critiques, comments, suggestions, and corrections from the readers are needed very much to make the thesis better. May Allah, the lord of universe, bless you all. Aamiin.

Pekanbaru, 16th March, 2011
The Writer

Enda Royani

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Backround of the Problem

Writing is one of the important skills that should be mastered by students. Writing skills are involved in writing are complex. It is related to content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. It is related also to produce coherence, unity, capitalization, and coma rules in one paragraph. Even, it has the systematic ways how to organize ideas into readable text and how to convey information in order that the message from the writer can be catches by the reader easily.

SMP Negeri I Rambah is one of Junior High Schools in Rokan Hulu Regency which is located in Pasir Pengarayan. Based on the syllabus of this school, writing was taught by the English teacher at the last competency¹. In SMP Negeri I Rambah especially for students at the second year in semester 2, the basic competence in teaching writing is the students are able to express meaning of certain texts through written short functional texts and essay texts accurately, fluently, and acceptable to communicate with surrounding environment. The materials of writing subject are short functional texts and essay texts. Short functional texts are focused on invitation, announcement, and short message. While, essay texts are focused on recount and narrative text. The graduated

¹ Syllabus of SMP Negeri I Rambah 2010/2011. (Pasir Pengarayan:unpublished 2010/2011)

standard of writing in this school was 65. The English teacher successful in teaching writing if all of the students at the second year able to reach that score.

In reaching the goal of teaching writing, the English teacher has been taught writing maximally. Based on primarily observation on 27th May 2010, the English teacher who taught English at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah still use conventional learning. Teacher was monopolizing teaching and learning process. Then, the students are instructed to write short functional texts individually. The students seemingly got difficulties to accomplish the task. The result is students could not pass the graduated standard 100%. She found that the students' score in writing short functional texts still low. It can be seen in the following phenomena:

1. The students have low competence of grammatical structure.
2. Some of the students are not able to write short functional texts clearly and to the point.
3. Some of the students do not enable to choose the appropriate vocabulary suitable to the context and situation.
4. Some of the students got difficulties in writing caused by learning strategy were not help them easily to accomplish writing tasks.

To improve students' writing ability in writing short functional texts need an appropriate learning strategy. Because of writing is a creativity, some strategies and techniques must be implemented. One of them is collaborative learning. Collaborative learning is a situation in which two or more people learn

or attempt to learn something together². The activity is to work together to develop a plan, resolve a problem, or complete the task.

Based on phenomena depicted on page 2, the researcher is interested in conducting a research entitled **“THE DIFFERENCE ON WRITING ABILITY OF THE STUDENTS TAUGHT BY USING COLLABORATIVE LEARNING AND CONVENTIONAL LEARNING AT THE SECOND YEAR OF SMP NEGERI I RAMBAH OF ROKAN HULU REGENCY”**.

²http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collaborative_learning to the participant. Collaborative learning. From wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

B. The Problem

1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the background and phenomena above, the writer would like to identify the problems as follows:

- a. Do the students have low competence of grammatical structure?
- b. Why some of the students are not able to write short functional texts clear and to the point?
- c. Why some of the students do not enable to choose the appropriate vocabulary suitable to the context and situation?
- d. Do the students got difficulties in writing caused by learning strategy was not help them easily to accomplish writing tasks?

2. The Limitation of the Problem

In this research, the researcher needs to limits the problems of the research on finding the students' writing ability in writing short functional texts taught by using collaborative learning, the students' writing ability in writing short functional texts taught by using conventional learning, and the difference between students' writing ability in writing short functional texts taught by using collaborative and conventional learning.

3. The Formulation of the Problem

Based on limitation of the problem depicted above, thus, the problems of this research will be formulated in the following research questions:

- a. How is the students' writing ability in writing short functional text taught by using conventional learning at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah?
- b. How is the students' writing ability in writing functional text taught by using collaborative learning at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah?
- c. Is there any significant difference on writing ability of the students in writing short functional text taught by using collaborative and conventional learning at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah?

C. The Reasons for Choosing the Title

- a. This problem is interested to be researched because it can give us a lot of information about Collaborative Learning.
- b. The writer can use collaborative learning for the alternative of teaching methods especially in teaching writing.
- c. The title of this research is very necessary to be investigated because the researcher wants to know whether there is any significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by Collaborative learning and Conventional Learning.
- d. The students at SMP Negeri I Rambah still get difficulties in writing. Thus, the researcher wants to offer a solution through introducing collaborative learning.

D. The Objective and Significance of the Research

1. The Objective of the Research

- a. To find out the students' writing ability in writing short functional texts taught by using conventional learning.
- b. To find out the students' writing ability in writing functional texts taught by using collaborative learning.
- c. To find out whether there is any significant difference on writing ability of the students in writing short functional texts taught by using collaborative and conventional learning.

2. The Significance of the Research

Theoretically, these research findings are expected to support the existence of the theories on the foreign language learning especially in writing subject. Practically, these research findings are expected to provide positive contributions and information to the researcher in conducting and acquiring her knowledge especially in the field on educational research, which is in English Language Teaching (ELT). Besides, these research findings are expected to provide the students and the teachers of SMP Negeri I Rambah about the information of their learning especially on writing subject.

E. The Definition of Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding in comprehending the title, it is necessary to define the terms used as follows:

- a. Difference is a way in which something has changed. Yet, in this research, difference means that the different on writing ability of the students taught by using two different methods (Collaborative and Conventional learning)
- b. Writing is an activity of writing³. Writing is an activity that a person does to express his or her ideas, feelings, or something by using written language.
- c. Ability is capacity of power to do something physical or mental (Hornby, 1989:1). It means someone's capacity to do something, both physical and mental.
- d. Short functional text is short text which is found in daily life such as command, instruction, prohibition, invitation, greeting card, short message, shopping list, notice, and announcement⁴.
- e. Collaborative learning is a general term for an approach to teaching and learning which makes learners working together in small groups. A form of collaborative learning in which specific rules and responsibilities for group members and for the of group- based activities is known as cooperative learning. Collaborative learning is an approach to teaching and learning in which classrooms are organized so that the students work together in small co-operative teams⁵.
- f. Conventional Learning is a traditional learning or strategy of extracurricular lecture. In this case, the English teachers still monopolize

³ Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary. 1983. p. 502

⁴<http://www.smpn1depok.com/mediapembelajaran/daryanto/kelas8/bahasainggris/materiI/announcement/html>

⁵Richard Jack C and Richards Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (3th ed). London: Longman Person Education Limited. P. 124

teaching and learning process by using expository method and the students only as a receiver of information or material given by the teacher⁶.

⁶ <http://xpresiriau.com/artikel-tulisan-pendidikan/pembelajaran-konvensional/>

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. The Theoretical Framework

Writing is not an easy work, especially for students at Junior High School. Producing a coherent, fluent, extended piece of writing is the most difficult thing to do. The writing skills are complex, not only requiring mastery of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgmental elements. It is related to master of vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and rhetorical pattern. Even, Heaton¹ says that there are various necessary skills for writing good prose into five general components. They are:

1. Language use: the ability to write correct and appropriate sentences.
2. Mechanical skills: the ability to use correctly those conventions peculiar to the written language such as punctuation and spelling.
3. Treatment of content: the ability to think creatively and develop thoughts, excluding all irrelevant information.
4. Stylistic skills: the ability to manipulate sentences and paragraphs, and use language effectively.
5. Judgment skills: the ability to write in an appropriate manner for particular purpose with a particular audience in mind, together with an ability to select, organize and order relevant information.

Besides, Brown says that there is taxonomy of micro and macro-skills of writing. Micro skills are including to;

¹ Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Test*. United States of America: Longman Inc p. 135

1. Produce graphemes and orthographic patterns of English.
2. Produce writing at an efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose.
3. Produce an acceptable core of words and use appropriate word order patterns.
4. Use acceptable grammatical systems (tense, agreement, pluralization, patterns, rules).
5. Express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms.
6. Use cohesive devices in written discourse.

While, macro skills are;

1. Use the rhetorical forms and conventions of written discourse.
2. Appropriately accomplish the communicative functions of written texts according to form and purpose.
3. Convey links and connections between events, communicate such relations as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification.
4. Distinguish between literal and implied meaning when writing.
5. Correctly convey culturally specific references in the context of the written text.
6. Develop and use a battery of writing strategies, such as accurately assessing the audience's interpretation, using pre-writing devices, writing with fluency in the first drafts, using paraphrases and synonyms, soliciting peer and instructor feedback, and using feedback for revising and editing.

1. Genres of Writing

There are three kinds of writing genres that second language learners need to acquire². They are:

a. Academic Writing. The examples:

1. Papers and general subject report
2. Essays, compositions
3. Academically focused journals
4. Short-answer test responses
5. Technical report
6. Theses, dissertations

b. Job-related writing. Such as:

1. Messages (phone messages)
2. Letters/emails
3. Memos
4. Reports
5. Schedules, labels, signs
6. Advertisements, announcement

c. Personal writing

1. Letters, emails, greeting card, invitations
2. Messages, notes
3. Calendar entires, shopping lists, reminders
4. Financial documents (checks, tax forms, loan applications)

²H. Doghlas Brown. 2003. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: Longman. Com p. 219

5. Forms, questionnaires, medical reports, immigration documents
6. Diaries, personal journals
7. Fiction (short stories, poetry)

2. Types of writing performance

Four categories of written performance of written production³, they are:

- a. Imitative; it is the ability to spell correctly and to perceive phoneme-grapheme correspondences in the English spelling system.
- b. Intensive; it is the ability to produce appropriate vocabulary within a context, collocations, idioms, and correct grammatical features up to the length of the sentence
- c. Responsive; it is the ability to connect sentences into paragraph and creating logically connected sequence of two or three paragraphs
- d. Extensive; it is related to ability on focusing on achieving a purpose, organizing and developing ideas logically, using details to support illustrate ideas, demonstrating syntactic and lexical variety.

3. Short Functional Text

Short functional text is short text which is found in daily life such as advertisement, announcement, short message, note, shopping list, memo, and

³H. Doghlas Brown. 2003. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: Longman. Com p. 220

invitation. According to Muhaimin⁴, short functional texts that the students have been learning in Junior High School level are advertisement, short message, announcement, list of thing, and invitation. Yet, in the syllabus of SMP Negeri I Rambah⁵, short functional texts that the students learn are invitation, announcement, and short message.

a. Invitation

Function/Purpose: to invite someone to attend an occasion. The

Structure/Parts: a. the addressee (the person invited), b. Salutation. c. The message (the content of message). d. The sender

Characteristics of good invitation:

1. It should have an accurate addressee.
2. It gives clear time, place, and activity.
3. It provides sufficient information about the inviter.
4. Express the writer is looking forward to seeing person.
5. If there is address code, state in the lower left-hand corner.

b. Announcement

Function: Announcement provides complete and clear information about certain event and occasion.

Characteristics of good announcement:

1. Short, inviting, and to the point
2. Clear and complete information (time, place, date)

⁴ Muhaimin. 2009. *The Strategic Ways to Face English Test Kunci-Kunci Strategis Menaklukkan Segala Jenis Ujian Bahasa Inggris*. Jogjakarta:DIVA Press p. 135

⁵ Syllabus of SMP Negeri I Rambah 2010/2011. (Pasis Pengarayan:unpublished 2010/2011)

3. It has address of person who has announced and whom has invited.
4. For a bad news, make a direct and nonsense statement.

c. Short Message

The function is to send an important message to other people. It can be found in SMS and memo. Characteristics of good Short Message are⁶:

1. Clear addressee (someone who receives the message).
2. Straight forward.
3. If it is an instruction, state it clearly.

4. Teaching Writing

Teaching writing is not an easy matter. The teachers must be competent in selecting of the appropriate strategy. As researcher says in the previous chapter, the appropriate strategy in teaching writing is collaborative learning. Kalayo Hasibuan states that “guided writing involves the teacher working with small group of students”. Further, David Hornsby in Kalayo Hasibuan says that “guided writing is useful for a range of teaching purposes, which will vary, depending on the developmental stage and the needs of the students”⁷. Teacher in this chance has role as an observer of discussion and analyst of students’ writing. The session is focused on specific aspects of writing which has developed by students.

⁶http://www.smpn1depok.com/mediapembelajaran/daryanto/kelas8/bahasainggris/materi1/short_message.html

⁷Hasibuan, Kalayo and M. Fauzan Ansari. 2007. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press p. 126

Teaching writing based on the purposes can help the students establish a certain text on writing. They can specify what text should be created and they can also identify what tenses that should be used and which word which proper used is. Heaton states that “The purpose of writing will also help to establish a particular register: for example, is the students writing to entertain, inform, or explain?”⁸.

Besides writing based on the purposes, writing based on the text types also help students in writing certain text easily. Susan Hill in her book *Guiding Literacy Learners* states that:

“Guided writing involves individuals or small groups of students writing a range of text types. The teacher may provide short mini lessons to demonstrate a particular aspect of text type, grammar, punctuation or spelling. Guided writing is linked to reading and various text types are used as models.”⁹

From several statements above, the researcher concludes that teaching writing based on the purposes and text types of writing helps the students create a certain text of writing with appropriate usage of aspects of writing such as tenses, choice of word, grammar, and punctuation.

5. The Process of Writing

Kate Grenville says that there are six steps guide on writing. They are:

- a. Getting ideas
- b. Choosing (selecting the ideas you think will be most useful).

⁸Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. United States of America: Longman Inc p. 135

⁹Hasibuan, Kalayo and M. fauzan Ansari. 2007. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press p. 126

- c. Outlining (putting the ideas into the best order-making a plan).
- d. Drafting (doing a first draft from beginning to end, without going back).
- e. Revising (cutting, adding or moving parts of this draft where necessary).
- f. Editing (proofreading for grammar, spelling, and paragraphs).

Anthony Seow in Jack C Richard says that the processes of writing activity incorporate the four basic writing stages¹⁰, they are planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Further, here the explanation all of them:

a. Planning (pre-writing)

Pre-writing is any activity in the classroom that encourages students to write. It stimulates thoughts for getting started. This activity aims to generate tentative ideas and gather information for writing. The following activities are stages in pre-writing; it is done through several stages. They are: a. Group brainstorming b. Clustering c. Rapid Pre-Writing d. WH-Questions. It helps the students to develop topic easily.

b. Drafting

At the drafting stage, the writer is focused on the fluency of writing. One dimension of good writing is the writer's ability to visualize an audience.

c. Revising

In this opportunity, the students review their text on the basis of the feedback given in the responding stage. It is done to improve global content and the organization of ideas in order that the writer's intent is clear to the reader.

¹⁰Richards, Jack. C and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (3th Ed). London: Longman Pearson Education

Revising here is as a mirror how effectively the students have communicated their meaning to the reader.

d. Editing

At this stage, students are engaged in tidying up their texts as a final draft that should be evaluated by the teacher. Editing process is done through rechecking the grammar, spelling, punctuation, diction, sentence structure and accuracy of supportive textual material such as quotation, example.

6. Evaluating Writing

In evaluating students' writing, the scoring can be analytical (based on specific aspect of writing ability) and can be holistic (based on a global interpretation of the effectiveness of that piece of writing). Arthur Hughes states that "Analytical scoring as methods of scoring which require a separate score for each of a number of aspects of a task"¹¹. Besides, holistic scoring involves the assignment of a single score to a piece of writing on the basis of an overall impression of it¹². In evaluating students' writing, the teacher is expected very much to evaluate only writing ability, and nothing else. In order to be effective, the criteria of evaluation include overall interpretation of the task, sense of audience, relevance, development and organization of ideas, format or layout, grammar and structure, spelling and punctuation, range and appropriateness of vocabulary, and clarity of communication.

¹¹ Hughes Arthur.1989. *Testing for Language Teacher*. (2nd Ed). New York: Cambridge University Press. p. 100

¹² Hughes, Arthur *Ibid*, 94-95

In this research, the students' writing ability will be measured by using ESL Composition Profile. The criteria of ESL Composition Profile consist of five components. They are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

7. Collaborative Learning

Collaborative learning is a situation in which two or more people learn or attempt to learn something together¹³. It is commonly illustrated when group of the students work together to share their understanding, meaning, or solution of the problem to create the product of their learning. The aim of this method is specifically to increase the success of team.

Kalayo Hasibuan says that the effective collaborative activities have three characteristics.

- a. Communication gap; each student has relevant information that the others does not have.
- b. Task orientation; activity has a defined outcome, such as solving a problem
- c. Time limit; students have a preset amount of time to complete the task¹⁴.

Group and collaborative work in language classroom provides non-threatening situation for developing communicative skills and fulfilling the linguistic need for interaction (Long and Porter, 1985; Peyton and Reed, 1991; Peyton and Staton, 1991; Pica et al, 1987)¹⁵. In this section, collaborative work in

¹³ Wikipedia. *Collaborative Learning*. The Free Encyclopedia

¹⁴Hasibuan, Kalayo and M. fauzan Ansari. 2007. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press p. 44

¹⁵Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. United States: Prentice Hall Regents p. 155

learning is used as an umbrella for a variety of approaches in education. Even, collaborative learning redefines traditional student-teacher relationship in the classroom that has results is more beneficial. Joy M Reid also stated that writing is easier, better, and more successful when talking, drafting, revising, and editing in group.

Danil Muijs and David Reynolds say that there are many advantages of collaborative learning, they are:

- a. The advantages are existed on aspect of cooperative work that has given positive contribution in developing students' socialization. Working together in group discussion can help students to develop their emphatic through giving chance to the other members of group to convey their point of view, unconsciously, it can helps the students to be aware speak in public speaking and also each member understand that everybody has plus(goodness) and minus (weakness).
- b. The students attempt to find the solutions of the problem together. The students are able to develop the competence such as the need to accommodate the others' point of view all at once.
- c. Total knowledge on group discussion tends to be compare with the knowledge personally. Its situation enable students to solve their problem more stronger and mutual giving contradiction.

From several explanations above, the researcher concludes that collaborative learning is a good strategy that must be applied in teaching and learning process especially in teaching writing. We can imagine that how effective

it is in teaching and learning process. In other's perspective, this strategy gives chance to the students to practice social life with surrounding.

Working in collaborative learning, the members of group must be arranged as good as possible. The ability of the members must be different or heterogenous. Danil Muijs and David Reynold say "group which consists of the students who have high and medium ability or medium and low ability, give and receive much more explanation than students who has high, medium, and low ability in one group discussion"¹⁶. Further, they say if group consists of the students who have the same ability (homogeny), it will defined the student whom high ability considered that mutual helping is not necessary with his/her members. Meanwhile, student who has low ability is not able to do that.

The efficient of collaborative work discussion needs significant preparation. There are several preconditions to operate collaborative work discussion¹⁷. They are:

1. The students should able to work together and mutual help each other constructively.
2. The students should have sharing skills
3. The students should have participation skills.
4. The students should have communication skills.
5. The students should have listening skills.

¹⁶ Muijs Danil and David Reynold. 2008. Efektif Teaching Teori dan Aplikasi. (2nd Ed). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p. 86

¹⁷ Muijs Danil and David Reynold. 2008. Efektif Teaching Teori dan Aplikasi. (2nd Ed). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p. 83

How are the ways to instruct the students in collaborative work?

Jhonson and Jhonson (1994) in Danil Muijs say that there are some rules in running collaborative work well¹⁸. They suggest that through giving character to each member such as following explanation.

1. The Summarizer. She/he will prepare everything that they need in presenting their entire summary in front of the class.
2. The Researcher. She/he has obligation to collect all of basic information and mutual information to accomplish the task.
3. The Checker. She/he is a person who has responsibility in checking the facts that are used in her/his group. The facts should given answers to the probably question from other group.
4. The Runner. She/he attempts to find the resources that they need in their group to accomplish the task such as dictionary.
5. The Observer. She/he is an observer or an arbiter the problems. She/he has obligation to write and to record the activities during debriefing.

Beside, Joy M Reid has suggestions also how to plan group work. It is often helpful for each student to have a role in the group, a contribution to make: as a recorder, an “dea-person”, an organizer, and so on¹⁹. They are:

1. Select the groups so that each student can participate fully.
2. Review the ground rules.

¹⁸Muijs Danil and David Reynold. 2008. *Efektif Teaching Teori dan Aplikasi*. (2nd Ed). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p. 85

¹⁹Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. United States: Prentice Hall Regents pp. 157-158

3. Explain what the task is, why they will be doing it, and how long they will have to complete it (as a rule, tell the students they have less time than you have actually planned); a statement of realistic purpose and clear roles for each member of the group is essential.
4. Give the groups a limited task; write instructions on the board or on a handout.
5. Model the task; in a reader-response task for a textbook essay, the teacher might put another essay on a transparency and use an overhead projector and a marker pen to annotate the essay for the class, speaking aloud as she/he reacts to essay (I wonder why the author said this....What does this word mean?...Oh I don't agree with this at all.....Nice description here").
6. If you have the groups report to the class, have the class applaud (or give positive feedback in other ways) after each presentation (to ease the discomfort and to promote enthusiasm and a sense of community)
7. At the end of the activity, have the students write in their journals, analyzing the success of the activity, or reporting the results, or describing the process of the activity.

A number of studies found that collaborative work has positive relationship to students' achievement if interaction of group mutual respect in nature. Vice versa, it has negative relationship if the members of group did not respect each other²⁰.

²⁰ Muijs Danil and David Reynold. 2008. *Efektif Teaching Teori dan Aplikasi*. (2nd Ed). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p. 82

For this reason, collaborative learning will be efficient and give positive contribution if each member in-group has feeling how to respect others is. Besides, giving character to each member will make the students take participation during discussion take place.

8. Conventional Learning

Conventional Learning is a strategy of learning which make the students as an object of learning (receiver) of information/materials passively²¹. It is defined as a strategy of learning which teacher usually used in learning process. Teacher in this part still monopolize in conveying the materials. They considered that group work discussion and the like spent much time even though, in fact, their assumption is not true.

Basic knowledge about human being needs cooperation with the other, it is proper that collaborative learning to be continued in teaching and learning process rather than conventional learning because collaborative learning has many advantages. One of them is dividing the task to each member. Each of them has obligation to accomplish the task. So, teaching and learning process will become more active and attractive. The students convey their knowledge to his members, they share their idea and they can fulfill their weaknesses through peer of education.

²¹ Wina Sanjaya Dr. 2006. *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.

9. The differences between Collaborative and Conventional Learning

Based on the explanations above, the researcher concludes that the differences between collaborative and conventional learning are:

- a. Collaborative learning will create the active learners. Conventional Learning will make the students become passive learners (receiver).
- b. In collaborative learning the students learn based on the experiences and the study has link with the real activities. In conventional learning the study is theoretical character.
- c. Collaborative learning able to make learning and teaching process become attractive through solving the problems/tasks by themselves or discussing section. Conventional learning is not because the students in this chance only listen to the teacher in giving materials.
- d. The ability of the students in collaborative learning gotten based on the dig of experiences. In conventional learning the ability of the students gotten from the tasks was given by the teacher.
- e. In collaborative learning the knowledge of individual can develop continuously suitable with their experiences that he has undergone. In conventional learning the knowledge is absolute and final because their knowledge is designed by others.

B. The Relevant Research

There are some researchers studies about the Collaborative Learning, they are:

1. Officer Nofri Yusni (2008) in her research “The Application of Collaborative Learning Method to Increase the Studying Interest in Mathematic at the First Year Students of SMP 2 INUMAN”. She found that Collaborative Learning can increase the students’ interest in studying Mathematic. It can be seen from Mean before and after giving treatment; Mean before treatment is 49.9886 and mean after giving treatment becomes 54.0397. She suggested that it is better to use collaborative learning to increase the students’ interesting in learning mathematic. The difference with my research is on research finding; it is found “is there any significant contribution on the use of collaborative learning toward students’ interest on studying mathematic? While in my research try to find out the difference on writing ability of the students taught by using collaborative learning and conventional learning.
2. Husnul Khotimah (2008) in her research entitled “Applying of Collaborative Learning Method to Increase the Result of Learning Mathematic at the First Year Students of MTsN Bengkalis”. She found that there was significant contribution of Collaborative Learning toward students’ achievement on studying Mathematic at the first year students of MTsN Bengkalis. It can be seen from the increasing of Mean before and after giving treatment. Before applying Collaborative Learning method, Mean of the score is 32.33 and after applying Collaborative Learning, Mean arise becomes 39.11. The difference both of our research is on research finding; it is found “is Collaborative learning can increase students’ achievement on studying Mathematic? While

in this research tries to find out the difference on writing ability of the students taught by using Collaborative Learning and Conventional Learning.

C. The Operational Concept

The operational concept is the concept to give explanation the theoretical framework in order to avoid misunderstanding to the title of the research. There are two variables in this research. Variable X is Collaborative Learning and Variable Y is the students' writing ability. Therefore, the operational concept of the research can be seen in the following procedures of teaching and indicators:

Variable X: Teaching treatment by using Collaborative Learning. Before giving treatment, the researcher divided the students into six groups. Each group consists of five students. The researcher told the students who as a summarizer, researcher, checker, runner, observer, and recorder (giving character). They free to choose one of the characters in their group by themselves. Then, the researcher explained them what the obligation each of them is on group discussion. Teaching procedures according to Good et al (1992. h. 140) in Danil Muijs and Reynold are²²:

1. 10 minutes; Introduction, exploration, investigation, or reinforcement. It is done by the teacher. The activities are:
 - a. Explore the concepts and new skills.
 - b. Give various problematic situations and modeling several strategies.

²² Muijs Danil and David Reynold. 2008. Efektif Teaching Teori dan Aplikasi. (2nd Ed). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p. 91

- c. Guide the discussion in full meaning.
 - d. Give the exercise.
 - e. Clarify the expected results.
- 2. 5-10 minutes; doing group assignment part 1. It is done by the students in group work discussion. The activities are:
 - a. Investigation, reinforcement, expansion various concepts by using exercise given. The activities are:
 - b. Exploration.
 - c. Investigation.
 - d. Application.
 - e. Reinforcement.
- 3. 5 minutes; accessing the progress/processing and clarifying. It is done by the teacher. The activities are:
 - a. Active discussion section, teacher asks the question to the students.
 - b. Discuss the problems of situation.
 - b. Discuss the strategy/process/discovery.
 - c. Give the new progress.
 - d. Give the new exercises.
- 4. 10-15 minutes; doing exercise part 2. It is done by the students in group work discussion.
- 5. 5 minutes; review/summary of exercises. It is done by the teacher. The activities are:
 - a. Review briefly what the purpose is.

- b. Review the exercise.
- c. Review the discovery.
- d. Connect with study in the past time and in the future.

Variable Y: Students' writing ability.

The indicators of students' writing ability in writing are follows:

1. The students are able to write certain texts which relevant content
2. The students are able to write certain texts by using good organization
3. The students are able to write certain texts by using correct vocabulary
4. The students are able to write certain texts by using good grammatical order
5. The students are able to write certain texts by using correct mechanism

D. The Assumption and Hypotheses

1. Assumptions

Before going to formulation of the hypothesis as temporary answer of the problems, the researcher would like to present the assumptions. The researcher assumes that:

- a. Collaborative Learning is better than Conventional Learning especially to increase students' writing ability.
- b. Collaborative Learning will give a significant difference on writing ability of the students.

2. Hypothesis

Based on the formulation of the problem, objective, and explanation theory in theoretical framework and operational concept, the researcher has hypothesis as follows:

- a. Ho: There is no significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by using Collaborative Learning and Conventional Learning
- b. Ha : There is a significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by using Collaborative Learning and Conventional Learning

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. The Research Design

The design of the research is quasi-experimental research. In the research, the researcher tries to find the difference on writing ability on the students in writing functional texts taught by using collaborative learning and conventional learning after giving treatment to the experiment class (collaborative class).

B. The Time and the Location of the Research

The research was conducted on January to February 2011. The location of the research was at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah which is located in Pasir Pengarayan, Rokan Hulu.

C. The Subject and the Object of the Research

The subject of the research was the students at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah, Rokan Hulu. The object of the research was the students' writing ability.

D. The Population and Sample of the Research

The population of the research was the students at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah, Rokan Hulu. They consisted of four classes; VIII¹, VIII², VIII³, and VIII⁴. The number of population was 111 students and the number of sample was 56 students. It can be seen in the following table.

Table 1
The Population and Sample of the Research

No.	Classes	Population and Sample		
		Female	Male	Total
1.	VIII. 1	16	12	28
2.	VIII. 2	14	13	27
3.	VIII. 3	14	15	29
4.	VIII. 4	14	13	27
Total Population		58	53	111
Total sample		Class VIII² and class VIII³		56

The total population is large enough to be taken as a sample of the research. Yet, Sample of the research must represent all of populations. According to Gay¹, he says that "...a good sample is one that is representative of the population...". Based on the research design, the researcher took 50% from the total population as a sample of my research. The classes are VIII² and VIII³. Class VIII² was a control class and VIII³ was an experimental class. They have chosen by using simple random sampling through lottery.

The systematic ways on choosing the sample of the research by using lottery was suggested by Prof. Drs. Sutrisno Hadi, M. A². They are:

1. Make a certain list contains the group available in population.
2. Give the codes to each of the group.
3. Write the codes on small pieces of paper.
4. Roll its well.
5. Put them into a box.

¹Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 6th Ed). United State of America: Prentice-Hall Inc. p. 161

² Sutrisno Hadi. 2000. *Metodologi Research*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi pp. 83-84

6. Shake it well.

7. Take them one by one.

In conducting the research, the process of choosing the sample were such as following explanations:

1. The researcher provided four small pieces of paper because the population was only four classes.
2. The researcher than wrote two of the paper (collaborative class and conventional learning) and two else are empty.
3. The researcher called the chairperson of each class to choose the paper (lottery).

E. The Technique of Collecting Data

In relation to acquire the data from the students, the researcher employed one kind of instruments of the research. It was essay test. The test was done twice: pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given to the the sample of the research before treatment. Meanwhile, post-test was given after treatment. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 2
The Procedure of Treatment

Class	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental	T1	X	T2
Control	T1	-	T2

T1 : pre-test

T2 : post-test

X : treatment

The writing ability of the students was measured by using ESL Composition Profile. It is related to content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. The procedures of evaluating are in the following explanation:

1. Content

Table 3
Content

Score	Level	Criteria
30-27	Excellent to very good	Knowledgeable, substantive, thorough development of thesis, relevant to assign topic
26-22	Good to average	Some knowledgeable of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks detail
21-17	Fair to poor	Limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic
16-13	Very poor	Does not show the knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, not enough to evaluate

2. Organization

Table 4
Organization

Score	Level	Criteria
20-18	Excellent to very good	Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive
17-14	Very good to	Somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main

	average	ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.
13-10	Fair to poor	Non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development
9-7	Very poor	Does not communicate, no organization, not enough to evaluate

3. Vocabulary

Table 5
Vocabulary

Score	Level	Criteria
20-18	Excellent to very good	Sophisticated, effective range, range word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register
17-14	Good to average	Adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, usage but meaning not obscured
13-10	Fair to poor	Limited range, frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured
9-7	Very poor	Essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, not enough to evaluate

4. Language Use

Table 6
Language Use

Score	Level	Criteria
25-22	Excellent to very good	Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order or functions, articles, pronouns, prepositions
21-18	Very good to average	Effective but simple constructions, minors problems in complex construction, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/functions, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning never obscured
17-11	Fair to poor	Major problems in simple/complex constructions, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word/order/functions, articles, pronouns, prepositions and or fragments, deletions, meaning confused or obscured
10-5	Very poor	Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate, not enough to evaluate

5. Mechanic

Table 7
Mechanic

Score	Level	Criteria
5	Excellent to very good	Demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
4	Very good to average	Occasional errors of spelling, capitalization, paragraphing, but meaning not obscured
3	Fair to poor	Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obstructed
2	Very poor	Nor mastery of conventions, dominated by errors of spelling, punctuations, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible, not enough to evaluate

F. The Technique of Analyzing Data

The score of students' writing were analyzed by using statistical analysis that is by using T-Test³. The formula was as follows:

$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Where: t_0 = Table Observation

SD = Standard Deviation

³ Hartono. 2008. *Statistic Untuk Penelitian*. Pekanbaru:Pustaka Pelajar. p. 208

M_x = Mean of variable x

M_y = Mean of variable y

N = The Number of respondent

T-Test was obtained by considering the degree of freedom (df) = $(n_1 + n_2) - 2$ ⁴. The result of the formula will be obtained statistically through the hypotheses below:

- a. $H_0: t_0 < t_{table}$. It means that H_0 is accepted, there is no significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by using collaborative learning and conventional learning.
- b. $H_a: t_0 > t_{table}$. It means that H_a is accepted, there is significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by using collaborative Learning and conventional Learning.

G. Validity and Reliability of the Test

1. Validity

According to Gay⁵, validity is the appropriateness of the interpretations made from tests score. Clear validity is the core future for the test.

Furthermore, Gay says that there are three kinds of validity. They are content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity. All of them have different usage and function.

⁴ Hartono. 2008. *Statistic Untuk Penelitian*. Pekanbaru:Pustaka Pelajar. p. 206

⁵Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 6th Ed). United State of America: Prentice-Hall Inc. p. 161

Content Validity is used to compare content of the test to the domain being measured. According to Heaton, this kind of validity depends on careful analysis of the language being tested and of the particular course objectives. According to Gay⁶, there is no formula used to calculate and there is no way how to express it quantitatively. Content validity just focused on how well items represent the intended area. Even, Hadari Nawawi says that this kind of validity as a curricular validity⁷. It means that the test was given based on curriculum of the school.

Based on the definition above, to measure whether the test was valid in this research, the researcher used content validity. In other word, tests were given based on material that they have learned.

2. Reliability of the Test

According to Gay⁸, reliability is the degree to which the test consistently measures whatever it is measuring. Further, he says that:

“essay tests, short-answer tests, performance and product tests, projective tests, and observations almost any test that calls for more than a one-word response raise concerns about the reliability of scoring. In such situations we are concerned with interjudge (interscorer, interrater, interobserver) reliability and/or intrajudge reliability”.

⁶Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 6th Ed). United State of America: Prentice-Hall Inc. p. 164

⁷Nawawi, Hadari and M. Martini Hadari. 1991. *Instrumen Penelitian Bidang social*. Pontianak: Gajah Mada University Press

⁸Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 6th Ed). United State of America: Prentice-Hall Inc. p. 175

In this research, the researcher used interjudge reliability. It means that, the score of the test evaluated by more than one people. In this research, the students' writing ability evaluated by two raters.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A. The Presentation of the Data

The data of the research are the students' writing score in pre test and post-test of both classes: control class (conventional class) and experimental class (collaborative class). Data of pre test are the students' scores in writing an announcement, while data of post test are the students' scores in writing an invitation. Yet, in data analysis, the researcher only analyzed post test result because it more influences the research findings rather than pre-test. Post-test was given to the students in both classes after treatment is complete, during eight meetings. The test results were evaluated by two raters. The collective data can be seen in the following data presentation.

1. Students' Writing Ability on Pre-test

The students' writing ability on pre test can be seen in the following data presentation.

a. Conventional Class

The students' writing ability on pre-test in conventional class can be seen in the following table:

Table 8
Students' Writing Ability in Conventional Class

Score (x)	Frequency (f)	Percent
42	3	11.1%
45	2	7.4%
46	5	18.5%
48	3	11.1%
50	4	14.8%
52	1	3.7%
54	2	7.4%
58	1	3.7%
60	2	7.4%
61	1	3.7%
68	1	3.7%
69	1	3.7%
74	1	3.7%
Total	27	100%

From the table above, 3 students get score 42 (11.1%), 2 students get score 45 (7.4%), 5 students get score 46 (18.5%), 3 students get score 48 (11.1%), 4 students get score 50 (14.8%), 1 student gets score 52 (3.7%), 2 students get score 54 (7.4%), 1 students gets score 58 ((3.7%), 2 students get score 60 (7.4%), 1 student gets score 61 (3.7%), 1 student gets score 68 (3.7%), 1 student get score 69 (3.7%), 1 student gets score 74 (3.7%). The highest score is 74. The lowest score is 42. The highest frequency is 5 at the score 46. The lowest frequency is 1 at the score 52, 58, 61, 68, 69, and 74.

b. Collaborative Class

Writing ability of the students in collaborative class can be seen in the following table:

Table 9
Students' Writing Ability in Collaborative Class

Score (x)	Frequency (f)	Percent
55	5	17.2%
59	5	17.2%
61	4	13.8%
64	5	17.2%
70	5	17.2%
72	5	17.2%
Total	29	100%

From the table above, 5 students get score 55 (17.2%), 5 students get score 59 (17.2%), 4 students get score 61 (13.8%), 5 Students get score 64 (17.2%), 5 students get score 70 (17.2%), 5 students get score 72 (17.2%). The highest score is 72 and the lowest score is 55. The highest frequency is 5 at the score 55, 59, 64, 70, and 72. The lowest frequency is 4 at the score 61.

c. The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students on Pre-test of Both Classes.

The difference on writing ability of the students on pre-test can be seen in the following table:

Table 10
The Difference on Writing Ability of the students Both Classes

Student Code	Score in Collaborative Class	Student Code	Score in Conventional Class
S1	55	S1	42
S2	55	S2	60
S3	55	S3	69
S4	55	S4	46
S5	55	S5	52
S6	59	S6	46
S7	59	S7	50
S8	59	S8	42
S9	59	S9	50
S10	59	S10	46
S11	70	S11	58
S12	70	S12	45
S13	70	S13	45
S14	70	S14	48
S15	70	S15	48
S16	72	S16	42
S17	72	S17	48
S18	72	S18	50
S19	72	S19	74
S20	72	S20	46
S21	64	S21	54
S22	64	S22	68
S23	64	S23	46
S24	64	S24	50
S25	64	S25	60
S26	61	S26	61
S27	61	S27	54
S28	61	Total	1400
S29	61		
Total	1844		

From the table above, we can see the difference on writing ability of both classes. The difference lies on the total score of each class. The total score in class experiment (collaborative class) is 1844, while the total score in control class

(conventional class) is 1400. Beside, the highest score in collaborative class is 72 was gotten by 5 students and the lowest score is 5 was gotten by 5 students. Meanwhile, the highest score in conventional class is 74 was gotten by 1 student and the low score is 42 was gotten by 3 students.

2. Students' Writing Ability on Post Test

a. Students' Writing Ability in Conventional Class

Students' writing ability in conventional class can be seen in the following table.

Table 11
Students' Writing Score in Conventional Class

Score	Frequency	Percent
52	2	7.6%
55	5	19.0%
58	7	26.6%
61	5	19.0%
63	1	3.8%
66	1	3.8%
68	4	15.2%
70	1	3.8%
Total	26	100%

The researcher can give explanation that 2 students get score 52 (7.6%), 5 students get score 55 (19%), 7 students get score 58 (26.6%), 5 students

get score 61 (19%), 1 student gets score 63 (3.8%), 1 student gets score 66 (3.8%), 4 students get score 68 (15.2%), and 1 student gets score 70 (3.8%). The highest score is 70 and the lowest score is 52. The highest frequency is 7 at the score 58. The lowest frequency is 1 at the score 63, 66, and 70.

b. Students' Writing Ability in Collaborative Class

For students in collaborative class, students' writing ability describe in the following table.

Table 12
The Students' Writing Ability Collaborative Class

Score	Frequency	Percent
65	5	17.2%
71	5	17.2%
72	10	34.5%
75	4	13.8%
77	5	17.2%
Total	29	100%

From the table the researcher concludes that 5 students get score 65 (17.2%), 5 students get score 71 (17.2%), 10 students get score 72 (34.5%), 4 students get score 75 (13.8%), 5 students get score 77 (17.2%). The highest score is 77 belongs and the lowest score is 65. The highest frequency is 10 at the score 72. The lowest frequency is 4 at the score 75.

c. The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students in Collaborative Class and Conventional Class

Table 13

The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students

Student Code	Score in Collaborative Class	Student Code	Score in Conventional Class
S1	72	S1	55
S2	72	S2	58
S3	72	S3	66
S4	72	S4	68
S5	72	S5	58
S6	71	S6	63
S7	71	S7	61
S8	71	S8	55
S9	71	S9	55
S10	71	S10	58
S11	72	S11	70
S12	72	S12	61
S13	72	S13	68
S14	72	S14	58
S15	72	S15	61
S16	77	S16	55
S17	77	S17	52
S18	77	S18	52
S19	77	S19	68
S20	77	S20	61
S21	65	S21	61
S22	65	S22	58
S23	65	S23	58
S24	65	S24	58
S25	65	S25	68
S26	75	S26	55
S27	75	S27	-
S28	75	Total	1561
S29	75		
Total	2085		

From the table above, the researcher concludes that the difference on writing ability of the students in collaborative and conventional class lies on the total score of the both classes. The total score in experimental class (collaborative class) is 2085; meanwhile the total score in control class (conventional class) is 1561. Beside, the highest score in collaborative class is 77 was gotten by 5 students and the lowest score is 65 was gotten by 5 students. While, the highest score in conventional class is 70 was gotten by 1 student and the lowest score is 52 was gotten by 2 students.

B. The Data Analysis

To answer the formulations of the research, consisting of three formulations, here the researcher serves them completely, they are:

1. How is the students' writing ability taught by using conventional learning at the second year students of SMP Negeri I Rambah?
2. How is the students' writing ability taught by using collaborative learning at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah?
3. Is there any significant difference on the use of collaborative learning and the use of conventional learning toward writing ability of the students at the second year of SMP Negeri I Rambah?

The researcher analyzed the data manually and described the data by using graduated standard (SKL) of English in SMP Negeri I Rambah. They must reach score start and up 65. Means that, if the students' score 65, they passed

graduated standard. In contrary, if the students' score < 65 , it means that they do not pass the graduated standard.

1. The Students' Writing Ability Taught by Using Conventional Learning

The description of students' writing ability who taught by using conventional learning can be seen in the following table:

Table 14
The Students' Writing Ability Taught by Using Conventional Learning

Score (x)	Frequency (f)	fx	Graduated Standard
52	2	104	No pass
55	5	275	No pass
58	7	406	No pass
61	5	305	No pass
63	1	63	No pass
66	1	66	Pass
68	4	272	Pass
70	1	70	Pass
Total	26	1561	

From the data above, 20 students did not pass the graduated standard. Students who passed the graduated standard were only 6 students. The researcher can say that the total students who passed the graduated standard are 22.8% from the total students in conventional class.

2. The Students' Writing Ability Taught by Using Collaborative Learning

The description of the result, it can be seen in the following table below:

Table 15
The Students' Writing Ability in Collaborative Class

Score (x)	Frequency (f)	fx	Graduated Standard
65	5	325	Pass
71	5	355	Pass
72	10	720	Pass
75	4	300	Pass
77	5	385	Pass
Total	29	2085	

From the table above, the researcher takes conclusion that all of students pass the graduated standard. In other word, the students pass the graduated standard 100%.

3. The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students Taught by Using Collaborative and Conventional Learning.

To prove whether there is any significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by using collaborative and conventional learning, the

researcher tries to compare both of them by using T-test formula¹. The result is in the following explanation:

$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

t_0 : Table observation

M_x : Mean of the Score in Collaborative Class

M_y : Mean of the Score in Conventional Class

SD_x : Standard Deviation of the Score in Collaborative Class

SD_y : Standard Deviation of the Score in Conventional class

N : Number of the students

1 : Constanta

To get mean and standard deviation of the score both classes, according to Hartono², he says that if the total students or participants less than 30, to calculate mean and standard deviation of the score by using small sample of analysis. The result is in the following calculation:

¹ Hartono. *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. 2008. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p.208

² Hartono. *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. 2008. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p.204

Table 16
Mean and Standard Deviation of the Score

Score in Collaborative Class (X)	Score in Conventional Class (Y)	x	y	x ²	y ²
65	52	-6.9	-8.04	47.61	64.64
65	52	-6.9	-8.04	47.61	64.64
65	55	-6.9	-5.04	47.61	25.40
65	55	-6.9	-5.04	47.61	25.40
65	55	-6.9	-5.04	47.61	25.40
71	55	-0.9	-5.04	0.81	25.40
71	55	-0.9	-5.04	0.81	25.40
71	58	-0.9	-2.04	0.81	4.16
71	58	-0.9	-2.04	0.81	4.16
71	58	-0.9	-2.04	0.81	4.16
72	58	0.1	-2.04	0.01	4.16
72	58	0.1	-2.04	0.01	4.16
72	58	0.1	-2.04	0.01	4.16
72	58	0.1	-2.04	0.01	4.16
72	61	0.1	0.96	0.01	0.92
72	61	0.1	0.96	0.01	0.92
72	61	0.1	0.96	0.01	0.92
72	61	0.1	0.96	0.01	0.92
72	61	0.1	0.96	0.01	0.92
72	63	0.1	2.96	0.01	8.76
75	66	3.1	5.96	9.61	35.52
75	68	3.1	7.96	9.61	63.36
75	68	3.1	7.96	9.61	63.36
75	68	3.1	7.96	9.61	63.36
77	68	5.1	7.96	26.01	63.36
77	70	5.1	9.96	26.01	99.20
77	-	5.1		26.01	
77		5.1		26.01	
77		5.1		26.01	
77		5.1		26.01	
$\sum X = 2085$	$\sum Y = 1561$	$\sum x = 0$	$\sum y = 0$	$\sum x^2 = 410.69$	$\sum y^2 = 651.4$

Based on the table above, mean of the score in both classes are:

$$M_x = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2085}{29}$$

$$= 71.90$$

$$M_y = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$

$$M_y = \frac{1561}{26}$$

$$= 60.04$$

Standard Deviation of the score in both classes is:

$$SD_x = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{410.69}{29}}$$

$$= \sqrt{14.16}$$

$$= 3.76$$

$$SD_y = \sqrt{\frac{\sum y^2}{N}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{651.4}{26}}$$

$$= \sqrt{25.05}$$

$$= 5.005 \text{ or } 5.0$$

$$N_x = 29 \text{ and } N_y = 27$$

After finding mean and standard deviation of the score, the researcher analyzed them by using T-test such following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_0 &= \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}} \\
 &= \frac{71.90 - 60.04}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{3.76}{\sqrt{29-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{5.0}{\sqrt{26-1}}\right)^2}} \\
 &= \frac{11.86}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{3.76}{\sqrt{28}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{5.0}{\sqrt{25}}\right)^2}} \\
 &= \frac{11.86}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{3.76}{5.30}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{5}{5}\right)^2}} \\
 &= \frac{11.86}{\sqrt{(0.71)^2 + (1)^2}} \\
 &= \frac{11.86}{\sqrt{(0.50) + (1)}} \\
 &= \frac{11.86}{\sqrt{1.50}} \\
 &= \frac{11.86}{1.22} \\
 &= 9.72
 \end{aligned}$$

C. Testing hypothesis

From the calculation above, it can be seen that t_0 is 9.72. The T table is compared by getting degree of freedom (df). df can be seen in the following formula³:

$$\begin{aligned} df &= (N1+N2)-2 \\ &= (29+26)-2 \\ &= 55-2 \\ &= 53 \end{aligned}$$

The degree of freedom is 53. In the T table⁴, 53 is not find. In this case, the researcher took df 50. T table in the degree of freedom 50 in significance 5% and 1% are 2.01 and 2.68.

Based on the calculation above, the researcher found that $2.01 < 9.72 > 2.68$. It means that t_0 is higher than t table in significance 5% and 1%. In other word, H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference on writing ability of the students taught by using collaborative and conventional learning.

³ Hartono. *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. 2008. Yogyakarta:Pustaka Pelajar. p. 191

⁴ Hartono. *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. 2008. Yogyakarta:Pustaka Pelajar. p. 304

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the data analysis explained in chapter IV, the researcher takes three conclusions. They are:

1. Students' writing ability in conventional class is low. It can be seen from the total student who passed graduated standard (SKL) only 6 students. The total student who passed the graduated standard is 22.8% from the total students in conventional class. Mean of the score is 60.04 and standard deviation of the score is 5.0
2. Students' writing ability in collaborative class is high. It can be seen in the data analysis that all of students have passed the graduated standard (SKL) 100%. Mean of the score is 71.90 and standard deviation of the score is 3.76.
3. Students' writing ability who are taught by using collaborative learning are better than students who are taught by using conventional learning. It can be seen from the total students who passed the graduated standard (SKL), mean of the score and standard deviation of the score in post-test. In collaborative learning, the total students who passed the graduated standard is 100%, mean of the score is 71.90, and standard deviation is 3.76. Meanwhile, in conventional class the total student who passed the graduated standard (SKL) is only 22.8% from the total students in the conventional class, that is only 6 students. 20 students do not pass the graduated standard. Mean of the score is 60.04 and standard deviation of the score is 5.0. More details, the differences

on students' writing ability in collaborative class and conventional class; if total of students who passed graduated standard, mean of the score, and standard deviation of the score in post test both classes compared is in the following table:

Table 17
The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students

Class	Total student who passed graduated standard (SKL)	Mean of the score	Standard deviation
Collaborative Class	29 students or 100%	71.90	3.76
Conventional Class	6 from 20 students or 22.8%	60.04	5.0
Difference	20 students or 77.2% failed	11.86	-1.24

B. Suggestion

Based on the research findings and conclusions above, the researcher would like to give some suggestions to the teachers. They are:

1. Teachers should construct creative and comfortable circumstances learning for the students.
2. Teachers should teach the students by using suitable strategies based on basic competency in the syllabus.
3. Teacher should encourage the students to learn writing more through discussion section.
4. Teachers should encourage the students to make writing as habitual activities even though they should write simple writing such as their activity in daily life.

Finally, the researcher really hope that SMP Negeri I Rambah achieve the entire program of English and be better than before. To improve the students writing ability, the researcher suggest that to establish English Daily Article about current issues and make competition of writing article by using certain topic. Through this activity, the students will be aware that writing is not difficult subject but enjoyable subject.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1.1	Lesson Plan of Collaborative Class
Appendix 1.2	Lesson Plan of Conventional Class
Appendix 2.1	Test for Pre Test
Appendix 2.2	Test for Post Test
Appendix 3.1	Students' Score From Rater I (Pre Test and Post Test)
Appendix 3.2	Students' Score from Rater II (Pre Test and Post Test)
Appendix 4.1	Students' Score in Pre test of Conventional Class from Two Raters
Appendix 4.2	Students' Score in Pre test of Collaborative Class from Two Raters
Appendix 5.1	Students' Writing Ability in Post test of Conventional Class from Two Raters
Appendix 5.2	Students' Writing Ability in Post test of Collaborative Class from Two Raters
Appendix 6	Table "t" in 5% And 1%

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/ Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 2
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text by using writing performances accurately, fluntly and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicator: The students are able to create the best writing performance such as announcement on their group

3. Aims: -The students are able to identify the meaning and the function of SMS Short Hand

-The students are able to conprehend the abbreviation on SMS Short Hand

-The students are able to write short functional text on SMS Short Hand form, discuss and to find the solution on their writing through discussing together on their group

4. Material: Short Message (SMS) Short Hand

5. Teaching aid: some abrevations of SMS Short Hand

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting
- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- The teacher explain about collaborative learning (definition, rules, and character)

- The teacher gives character to each member of group and tells them what their responsibility is
- The teacher together with the students discuss about invitation (parts, kinds, steps how to write an invitation)

c. Post-activities

- The teacher ask the students to write an invitation for farewell party
- The teacher ask two groups of students to write their product in white board
- The teacher together with the other group of students evaluate the writing performance of the two groups above.

7. Resource

Book with the title “The Strategic Ways to Face English Test for Junior High School”, author Muhaimin

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 13 January 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/ Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 2
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text by using writing performances accurately, fluntly and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicator: The students are able to create the best writing performance such as announcement on their group

3. Aims: -The students are able to identify several kinds of announcement
-The students know what the steps to write an announcement are
-The students are able to discuss and to find the solution on their writing through discussing together on their group
-the students are able to write short functional text such as announcement on their group

4. Material: announcement

5. Teaching aid: kinds of announcement

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting
- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- The teacher gives examples of announcement
- The teacher asks the students to anlyze the announcement
- The teacher together with the srudents discuss about the announcement (parts and how to write announcement)

- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their character by themselves on completing the task
- c. Post-activities
 - The teacher ask the students to write an announcement
 - The teacher ask two groups of students to write their product in white board
 - The teacher together with the other group of students evaluate the writing performance of the two group above.

7. Resource

Book with the title “The Strategic Ways to Face English Test for Junior High School”, author Muhaimin, pulished by Diva Press

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 17 January 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/ Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 3
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text by using writing performances accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicator: The students are able to write and invitationannouncement based on the situation given

3. Aims: -The students are able to identify several kinds of invitation and announcement
-The students are able to discuss and to find the solution of their writing through discussing together on their group
-the students are able to write invitation and announcement based on situation given on their group

4. Material: invitation and announcement

5. Teaching aid: cards of invitation and announcement

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting
- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- The teacher asks the students sit based on their group
- The teacher asks one students from each group choose one of situation which arranged by the teacher in card form
- The teacher reviews about topic given (invitation and announcement)

- The teacher asks each group of the students to write the announcement/invitation based on the card they got
- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their character by themselves on completing the task

c. Post-activities

- The teacher ask the students to write an announcement
- The teacher ask two groups of students to write their product in white board
- The teacher together with the other group of students evaluate the writing performance of the two group above.

7. Resource

Book with the title “The Strategic Ways to Face English Test for Junior High School”, author Muhaimin, pulished by Diva Press

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 20 January 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 3
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text by using writing performances accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicator: The students are able to write Short Message (SMS Short Hand) correctly

3. Aims: -The students are able to identify the meaning and the function of SMS Short Hand

-The students are able to write short message correctly by using abbreviation available on SMS Short Hand, to discuss and to find the solution of their writing through discussing together on their group

4. Material: Short Message (SMS Short Hand)

5. Teaching aid: Some abbreviations on SMS Short Hand (I, U, W, R, B, C, D, 2, 4, G8, H8, Thx, Msg, LUV)

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting
- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- the teacher review about topic (SMS Short Hand)
- the teacher together with the students discuss about topic (meaning and function) Short Message Hand
- the teacher explain the abbreviations available on SMS Short Hand

- The teacher asks the students sit based on their group
- The teacher asks one students from each group choose one of card which arranged in card form
- The teacher asks each group of the students to write Short Messages based on the card they have choosen
- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their charracter by themselves on completing the task

c. Post-activities

- The teacher ask the students to write short mesage
- The teacher ask three groups of students to write their writing on white board
- The teacher together with the other group of students evaluate the writing performance of the three group above.

7. Resource

Book English on Sky 2 for Junior High School Students Year VIII, By Mukarto, et al. Publisher: Erlangga

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 20th January 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 4
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text on recount text form by using writing performances accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicators: -The students knows the definition, purpose and charracteristics of recount text

-The students understand the rhetorichal pattern/ganeric structure on writing recount text

-The students are able to identify simple past/Verb 2 on recount text

3. Aims: -The students understand about recount text

-The students comprehend the rhetorichal pattern and the charracteristics of recount text and they able to identify V on a recount text2write a recount text

-The students are able to discuss and to find the solution of their writing through discussing together on their group

4. Material: Recount Text (My Birthday Party)

5. Teaching aid: A text of recount text with the title “My Birthday Party”

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting
- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- the teacher asks the students about topic
- the teacher together with the students discuss about topic (meaning, purpose, characteristics, and rhetorical pattern)/Recount Text
- The teacher asks the students sit based on their group
- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their character by themselves on completing the task
- The teacher gives the copy of recount text
- The teacher asks the students give label (orientation, events, reorientation) to the text
- The teacher asks the students to find V2 on the text

c. Post-activities

- The teacher asks one group of students to write down the result of their discussion on white board
- Teacher together with the other group of the students evaluate the presentation

7. Resource

Book with the title “The Strategic Ways to Face English Test for Junior High School”, author Muhaimin, pulished by Diva Press

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL
Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 24th January 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 5
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text by using writing performances accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicators: -The students are able to identify generic structure of recount text corectly

-The students are able to create a recount text based on drafts

3. Aims: -The students more understand about recount text

-The students can identify specific information from the text

-The students are able to identify connectors on te text and understand how to use its on writing recount text

-The students are able to discuss and to find the solution of their writing through discussing together on their group

4. Material: Recount Text (Visiting the Doctor)

5. Teaching aid: A text of recount text with the title “Visiting the Doctor”

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting

- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- the teacher review the charracteristics of recount text

- the teacher asks the srudents sit based on their group

- The teacher gives a recount text to each group of the students
- The teacher reads the text loudly and the students listen to the teacher
- The teacher asks each group which has pointed to answer the question
- The teacher asks the students to find connectors on the text
- The teacher together with the students discuss how the usage of connectors on recount text is
- The teacher together with the students discuss on making drafts on writing recount text
- The teacher asks the students to write a recount text based on drafts above
- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their character by themselves on completing the task

c. Post-activities

- The teacher asks one group of students to write down the result of their discussion on white board
- Teacher together with the other group of the students evaluate the presentation

7. Resource

Book with the title “Smart Steps The Smartest to Learn English an English Textbook for Junior High School Grade VIII”, author Ali Akhmadi and Ida Safrida, pulished by Ganeca Exact

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using Standard of the English teacher own

Pasirpengarayan, 27th January 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 7
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text on narrative text form by using writing performances accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicators:
- The students knows the definition, purpose and charracteristics of narrative text
 - The students understand the rhetorichal pattern/ganeric structure on writing narrative text
 - The students are able to identify orientation, complication, and resolution on narrative text

3. Aims:
- The students understand about narative text
 - The students comprehend the rhetorichal pattern and the charracteristics of narrative text
 - The students are able to discuss and to find the solution of their writing through discussing together on their group

4. Material: Narrative text

5. Teaching aid: Narrative text with thhe title "The Legend of Lake Toba"

6. Steps of teaching

a. Pre-activities

- Greeting
- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- the teacher asks the students about topic
- the teacher together with the students discuss about topic (meaning, purpose, characteristics, and rhetorical pattern)/Narrative Text
- The teacher asks the students sit based on their group
- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their character by themselves on completing the task
- The teacher gives the other copy of narrative texts
- The teacher asks the students give label (orientation, complication, resolution) to the text

c. Post-activities

- The teacher asks each group of students to collect the result of their discussion

7. Resource

Book with the title “The Strategic Ways to Face English Test for Junior High School”, author Muhaimin, published by Diva Press and Book with the title “Smart Steps The Smartest to Learn English an English Textbook for Junior High School Grade VIII”, author Ali Akhmadi and Ida Safrida, published by Ganeca Exact

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL
Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 7th February 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

LESSON PLAN FOR COLLABORATIVE CLASS

School : SMP Negeri I Rambah
Subject : English
Class/Semester : VIII/II
Year : 2011
Meeting : 8
Time located : 2 x 40 minutes

1. Base Competence: Writing

Expressing the meaning on writing functional text on narrative text form by using writing performances accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily context

2. Indicators:
- The students understand the rhetorichal pattern/ganeric structure on writing narrative text
 - The students are able to identify orientation, complication, and resolution on narrative text
 - The students are able to arrange disoeder paragraph into good narative text
 - The students are able to write a narrative text which help by using some questions to develop their writing
3. Aims:
- The students comprehend the rhetorichal pattern and the charracteristics of narrative text
 - The students are able to write narrative text correctly based on rhetorichal pattern
 - The students are able to discuss and to find the solution of their writing through discussing together on their group
4. Material: Narrative text
5. Teaching aid: Disorder Narrative text
6. Steps of teaching
- a. Pre-activities
 - Greeting

- Check Attendance list

b. Whilst activities

- The teacher together with the students review about topic (meaning, purpose, characteristics, and rhetorical pattern)/Narrative Text
- The teacher asks the students sit based on their group
- The teacher asks each group of students to discuss their character by themselves on completing the task
- The teacher gives disorder narrative texts to the students
- The teacher asks the studentst to arrange the paragraphs

c. Post-activities

- The teacher asks each group of students to collect the result of their discussion

7. Resource

Book with the title “The Strategic Ways to Face English Test for Junior High School”, author Muhaimin, pulished by Diva Press and Book with the title “Smart Steps The Smartest to Learn English an English Textbook for Junior High School Grade VIII”, author Ali Akhmadi and Ida Safrida, pulished by Ganeca Exact

8. Assessment

Writing performance of each group will be measured by using ESL
Composition Profile

Pasirpengarayan, 10th February 2011

The English Teacher

The Researcher

Hj. Wendri Muharyati, S. Pd

NIP. 19670406 199103 2001

Enda Royani

NIM. 10714000727

Headmaster of SMP Negeri I Rambah

Ismail, S. Pd

NIP. 19640610 198803 1018

Appendix 2. 1

Test for Pre-Test

Instruction;

Write an announcement based on situations below:

1. You have meeting with your friends
2. Your teacher ask you to announce your classmate to attend flag ceremony on Monday
3. You and your friends supposed to attend extracurricular activity of English. Tell your friends about it!

Note; choose only one!

GOOD LUCK

Appendix 2. 2

Test for Post-Test

Instruction;

Write an invitation based on situations below:

1. You have birthday party next week; invite your friends to attend the party!
2. You will leave your village; invite your family to attend your farewell party!

Note; choose only one!

GOOD LUCK

Appendix 3. 1

STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE PRE TEST COLLABORATIVE CLASS

No	Students' code	Content	Organiz ation	Vocabu lary	Langua ge Use	Mechan ic	Total
1	Student 1	16	13	9	9	5	52
2	Student 2	16	13	9	9	5	52
3	Student 3	16	13	9	9	5	52
4	Student 4	16	13	9	9	5	52
5	Student 5	16	13	9	9	5	52
6	Student 6	14	12	12	12	4	54
7	Student 7	14	12	12	12	4	54
8	Student 8	14	12	12	12	4	54
9	Student 9	14	12	12	12	4	54
10	Student 10	14	12	12	12	4	54
11	Student 11	17	12	12	12	4	57
12	Student 12	17	12	12	12	4	57
13	Student 13	17	12	12	12	4	57
14	Student 14	17	12	12	12	4	57
15	Student 15	17	12	12	12	4	57
16	Student 16	17	10	12	12	5	56
17	Student 17	17	10	12	12	5	56
18	Student 18	17	10	12	12	5	56
19	Student 19	17	10	12	12	5	56
20	Student 20	17	10	12	12	5	56
21	Student 21	20	13	15	12	5	65
22	Student 22	20	13	15	12	5	65
23	Student 23	20	13	15	12	5	65
24	Student 24	20	13	15	12	5	65
25	Student 25	20	13	15	12	5	65
26	Student 26	17	9	12	12	3	53
27	Student 27	17	9	12	12	3	53
28	Student 28	17	9	12	12	3	53
29	Student 29	17	9	12	12	3	53

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater I

Kurnia Budiyaniti M. Pd

STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE
POST TEST
COLLABORATIVE CLASS

No	Students' code	Content	Organiza tion	Vocabul ary	Langua ge Use	Mechani c	Total
1	Student 1	20	13	13	9	6	61
2	Student 2	20	13	13	9	6	61
3	Student 3	20	13	13	9	6	61
4	Student 4	20	13	13	9	6	61
5	Student 5	20	13	13	9	6	61
6	Student 6	22	17	17	13	6	75
7	Student 7	22	17	17	13	6	75
8	Student 8	22	17	17	13	6	75
9	Student 9	22	17	17	13	6	75
10	Student 10	22	17	17	13	6	75
11	Student 11	22	17	17	17	8	81
12	Student 12	22	17	17	17	8	81
13	Student 13	22	17	17	17	8	81
14	Student 14	22	17	17	17	8	81
15	Student 15	22	17	17	17	8	81
16	Student 16	21	13	13	13	6	66
17	Student 17	21	13	13	13	6	66
18	Student 18	21	13	13	13	6	66
19	Student 19	21	13	13	13	6	66
20	Student 20	21	13	13	13	6	66
21	Student 21	20	13	13	13	6	65
22	Student 22	20	13	13	13	6	65
23	Student 23	20	13	13	13	6	65
24	Student 24	20	13	13	13	6	65
25	Student 25	20	13	13	13	6	65
26	Student 26	21	13	13	13	5	65
27	Student 27	21	13	13	13	5	65
28	Student 28	21	13	13	13	5	65
29	Student 29	21	13	13	13	5	65

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater I

Kurnia Budiyaniti M. Pd

STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE
PRE TEST
CONVENTIONAL CLASS

No	Students' code	Content	Organiza tion	Vocabu lary	Langua ge Use	Mechan ic	Total
1	Student 1	10	9	10	9	3	41
2	Student 2	16	9	9	9	5	48
3	Student 3	16	12	12	12	5	57
4	Student 4	16	12	9	9	3	49
5	Student 5	16	9	9	9	3	46
6	Student 6	16	13	9	9	3	50
7	Student 7	16	13	9	9	3	50
8	Student 8	16	9	9	9	2	44
9	Student 9	16	12	13	12	3	56
10	Student 10	16	12	9	9	5	51
11	Student 11	16	20	9	9	3	57
12	Student 12	16	9	9	13	3	50
13	Student 13	16	9	13	9	3	50
14	Student 14	16	12	12	9	5	54
15	Student 15	16	12	13	13	3	57
16	Student 16	16	9	9	9	2	45
17	Student 17	16	12	9	9	2	48
18	Student 18	16	13	9	9	3	50
19	Student 19	20	17	17	18	5	77
20	Student 20	16	12	9	9	5	51
21	Student 21	20	13	13	13	6	65
22	Student 22	16	12	9	9	3	49
23	Student 23	16	12	9	9	5	51
24	Student 24	15	9	9	9	2	44
25	Student 25	20	13	13	13	3	62
26	Student 26	16	12	9	12	3	52
27	Student 27	20	9	13	10	3	55

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater I

Kurnia Budiyaniti M. Pd

STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE
POST TEST
CONVENTIONAL CLASS

No	Students' code	Content	Organiza tion	Vocabu lary	Langua ge Use	Mechani c	Total
1	Student 1	10	9	12	9	5	45
2	Student 2	16	9	12	9	5	51
3	Student 3	20	12	13	12	6	63
4	Student 4	16	12	13	12	5	58
5	Student 5	16	9	9	9	5	48
6	Student 6	16	13	13	13	5	60
7	Student 7	16	12	12	12	5	57
8	Student 8	16	13	12	9	5	55
9	Student 9	16	12	12	13	5	58
10	Student 10	16	12	12	13	5	58
11	Student 11	20	20	12	13	5	70
12	Student 12	16	13	10	13	5	57
13	Student 13	20	13	13	13	5	64
14	Student 14	16	12	12	13	5	58
15	Student 15	16	12	13	13	5	59
16	Student 16	16	12	9	9	5	51
17	Student 17	16	12	9	9	5	51
18	Student 18	16	12	10	9	5	52
19	Student 19	20	17	17	18	5	77
20	Student 20	16	13	13	13	5	60
21	Student 21	20	13	13	13	6	65
22	Student 22	16	12	13	12	5	58
23	Student 23	16	12	13	12	5	58
24	Student 24	16	13	9	9	5	52
25	Student 25	22	13	14	13	5	67
26	Student 26	16	12	9	12	5	54
27	Student 27	0	0	0	0	0	0

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater I

Kurnia Budiyaniti M. Pd

**STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE
PRE TEST
CONVENTIONAL CLASS**

No	Students' code	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic	Total
1	Student 1	13	9	9	10	2	43
2	Student 2	22	14	14	18	4	72
3	Student 3	23	18	17	20	3	81
4	Student 4	13	9	9	10	2	43
5	Student 5	20	14	11	10	3	58
6	Student 6	13	9	9	8	3	42
7	Student 7	17	10	10	10	3	50
8	Student 8	13	9	9	7	2	40
9	Student 9	15	11	10	9	3	48
10	Student 10	13	9	9	8	2	41
11	Student 11	18	14	14	10	3	59
12	Student 12	13	9	10	6	2	40
13	Student 13	13	8	9	7	3	40
14	Student 14	13	9	9	9	2	42
15	Student 15	13	8	9	7	2	39
16	Student 16	13	9	8	7	2	39
17	Student 17	15	10	10	10	3	48
18	Student 18	17	10	10	10	3	50
19	Student 19	23	13	14	17	4	71
20	Student 20	13	9	9	8	2	41
21	Student 21	13	8	9	10	3	43
22	Student 22	25	18	20	20	4	87
23	Student 23	13	9	9	8	2	41
24	Student 24	20	12	11	10	3	56
25	Student 25	20	12	12	11	3	58
26	Student 26	23	14	15	14	4	70
27	Student 27	17	12	11	10	3	53

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater II

Jonri Kasdi S. Pd. I

STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE
POST TEST
CONVENTIONAL CLASS

No	Students' code	Content	Organiza tion	Vocabu lary	Langua ge Use	Mech anic	Total
1	Student 1	22	14	16	10	3	65
2	Student 2	22	14	13	12	4	65
3	Student 3	23	15	14	13	4	69
4	Student 4	25	17	17	15	4	78
5	Student 5	23	14	14	13	4	68
6	Student 6	22	14	14	12	4	66
7	Student 7	23	14	14	10	4	65
8	Student 8	18	11	11	11	4	55
9	Student 9	20	10	11	10	3	54
10	Student 10	21	11	12	10	4	58
11	Student 11	24	15	15	12	4	70
12	Student 12	23	13	14	12	4	66
13	Student 13	24	15	15	14	4	72
14	Student 14	20	12	12	11	3	58
15	Student 15	22	13	14	11	4	64
16	Student 16	20	12	13	10	4	59
17	Student 17	19	10	10	10	4	53
18	Student 18	18	10	10	10	4	52
19	Student 19	21	12	12	10	4	59
20	Student 20	22	13	14	11	4	64
21	Student 21	20	11	12	10	4	57
22	Student 22	20	12	12	11	4	59
23	Student 23	20	12	12	10	4	58
24	Student 24	22	13	13	12	4	64
25	Student 25	24	14	14	13	4	69
26	Student 26	20	11	11	10	4	56
27	Student 27	0	0	0	0	0	0

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater II

Jonri Kasdi S. Pd. I

Appendix 3. 2

STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE PRE TEST COLLABORATIVE CLASS

No	Students' code	Content	Organiza tion	Vocabu lary	Langua ge Use	Mechanic	Total
1	Student 1	18	14	13	9	4	58
2	Student 2	18	14	13	9	4	58
3	Student 3	18	14	13	9	4	58
4	Student 4	18	14	13	9	4	58
5	Student 5	18	14	13	9	4	58
6	Student 6	20	15	13	12	4	64
7	Student 7	20	15	13	12	4	64
8	Student 8	20	15	13	12	4	64
9	Student 9	20	15	13	12	4	64
10	Student 10	20	15	13	12	4	64
11	Student 11	25	18	18	18	4	83
12	Student 12	25	18	18	18	4	83
13	Student 13	25	18	18	18	4	83
14	Student 14	25	18	18	18	4	83
15	Student 15	25	18	18	18	4	83
16	Student 16	27	20	18	18	5	88
17	Student 17	27	20	18	18	5	88
18	Student 18	27	20	18	18	5	88
19	Student 19	27	20	18	18	5	88
20	Student 20	27	20	18	18	5	88
21	Student 21	20	15	13	11	4	63
22	Student 22	20	15	13	11	4	63
23	Student 23	20	15	13	11	4	63
24	Student 24	20	15	13	11	4	63
25	Student 25	20	15	13	11	4	63
26	Student 26	23	15	14	13	4	69
27	Student 27	23	15	14	13	4	69
28	Student 28	23	15	14	13	4	69
29	Student 29	23	15	14	13	4	69

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater II

Jonri Kasdi S. Pd. I

**STUDENTS' WRITING SCORE
POST TEST
COLLABORATIVE CLASS**

No	Students' code	Content	Organizational	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic	Total
1	Student 1	27	18	18	14	4	81
2	Student 2	27	18	18	14	4	81
3	Student 3	27	18	18	14	4	81
4	Student 4	27	18	18	14	4	81
5	Student 5	27	18	18	14	4	81
6	Student 6	24	14	13	12	4	67
7	Student 7	24	14	13	12	4	67
8	Student 8	24	14	13	12	4	67
9	Student 9	24	14	13	12	4	67
10	Student 10	24	14	13	12	4	67
11	Student 11	22	13	13	11	4	63
12	Student 12	22	13	13	11	4	63
13	Student 13	22	13	13	11	4	63
14	Student 14	22	13	13	11	4	63
15	Student 15	22	13	13	11	4	63
16	Student 16	27	18	18	20	5	88
17	Student 17	27	18	18	20	5	88
18	Student 18	27	18	18	20	5	88
19	Student 19	27	18	18	20	5	88
20	Student 20	27	18	18	20	5	88
21	Student 21	22	14	13	12	4	65
22	Student 22	22	14	13	12	4	65
23	Student 23	22	14	13	12	4	65
24	Student 24	22	14	13	12	4	65
25	Student 25	22	14	13	12	4	65
26	Student 26	27	18	18	17	5	85
27	Student 27	27	18	18	17	5	85
28	Student 28	27	18	18	17	5	85
29	Student 29	27	18	18	17	5	85

Pekanbaru, 2011
Rater II

Jonri Kasdi S. Pd. I

Appendix 4. 1

Table 4. 1
Students' Writing Ability in Conventional Class on Pre Test

Student Code	Rater 1	Rater 2	Final score
S1	41	43	42
S2	48	72	60
S3	57	81	69
S4	49	43	46
S5	46	58	52
S6	50	42	46
S7	50	50	50
S8	44	40	42
S9	52	48	50
S10	51	41	46
S11	57	59	58
S12	50	40	45
S13	50	40	45
S14	54	42	48
S15	57	39	48
S16	45	39	42
S17	48	48	48
S18	50	50	50
S19	77	71	74
S20	51	41	46
S21	65	43	54
S22	49	87	68
S23	51	41	46
S24	44	56	50
S25	62	58	60
S26	52	70	61
S27	55	53	54

Final score: $\frac{\text{score rater 1} + \text{score rater 2}}{2}$

Appendix 4. 2

Table 4. 2
Students' Writing Ability in Collaborative Class on Pre test

Student Code	Rater 1	Rater 2	Final score
S1	52	58	55
S2	52	58	55
S3	52	58	55
S4	52	58	55
S5	52	58	55
S6	54	64	59
S7	54	64	59
S8	54	64	59
S9	54	64	59
S10	54	64	59
S11	57	83	70
S12	57	83	70
S13	57	83	70
S14	57	83	70
S15	57	83	70
S16	56	88	72
S17	56	88	72
S18	56	88	72
S19	56	88	72
S20	56	88	72
S21	65	63	64
S22	65	63	64
S23	65	63	64
S24	65	63	64
S25	65	63	64
S26	53	69	61
S27	53	69	61
S28	53	69	61
S29	53	69	61

Appendix 5. 1

Table 5. 1
Students' Writing Score in Conventional Class on Post Test

Student Code	Rater 1	Rater 2	Final score
S1	45	65	55
S2	51	65	58
S3	63	69	66
S4	58	78	68
S5	48	68	58
S6	60	66	63
S7	57	65	61
S8	55	55	55
S9	56	54	55
S10	58	58	58
S11	70	70	70
S12	57	65	61
S13	64	72	68
S14	58	58	58
S15	58	64	61
S16	51	59	55
S17	51	53	52
S18	52	52	52
S19	77	59	68
S20	60	62	61
S21	65	57	61
S22	58	58	58
S23	58	58	58
S24	52	64	58
S25	67	69	68
S26	54	56	55
S27	-	-	-

Note: The total of students in post test was only 26 students. One student did not follow the test because he was absent.

Final score: $\frac{\text{score rater 1} + \text{score rater 2}}{2}$

Appendix 5. 2

Table 5. 2
Students' Writing Score in Collaborative Class on Post Test

Student Code	Rater 1	Rater 2	Final score
S1	63	81	72
S2	63	81	72
S3	63	81	72
S4	63	81	72
S5	63	81	72
S6	75	67	71
S7	75	67	71
S8	75	67	71
S9	75	67	71
S10	75	67	71
S11	81	63	72
S12	81	63	72
S13	81	63	72
S14	81	63	72
S15	81	63	72
S16	66	88	77
S17	66	88	77
S18	66	88	77
S19	66	88	77
S20	66	88	77
S21	65	65	65
S22	65	65	65
S23	65	65	65
S24	65	65	65
S25	65	65	65
S26	65	85	75
S27	65	85	75
S28	65	85	75
S29	65	85	75

Appendix 6

**TABEL NILAI “t” UNTUK TARAF SIGNIFIKAN
5% DAN 1 %**

df/db	5%	1%	df/db	5%	1%
1	12.71	63.66	24	2.06	2.80
2	4.30	9.92	25	2.06	2.79
3	3.18	5.84	26	2.06	2.78
4	2.78	4.60	27	2.05	2.77
5	2.75	4.03	28	2.05	2.76
6	2.45	3.71	29	2.04	2.76
7	2.36	3.50	30	2.04	2.75
8	2.31	3.36	35	2.03	2.72
9	2.26	3.25	40	2.02	2.72
10	2.23	3.17	45	2.02	2.69
11	2.20	3.11	50	2.01	2.68
12	2.18	3.06	60	2.00	2.65
13	2.16	3.01	70	2.00	2.65
14	2.14	2.98	80	1.99	2.64
15	2.13	2.95	90	1.99	2.63
16	2.12	2.92	100	1.98	2.63
17	2.11	2.90	125	1.98	2.62
18	2.10	2.88	150	1.98	2.61
19	2.09	2.84	200	1.97	2.67
20	2.09	2.84	300	1.97	2.59
21	2.08	2.83	400	1.97	2.59
22	2.07	2.82	500	1.96	2.59
23	2.07	2.81	1000	1.96	2.58

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (4thEd). San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2003. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: Longman.com
- Daryanto, Drs. 2009. *Panduan Proses Pembelajaran Kreatif dan Efektif*. Jakarta: AV Publisher
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2006. "Syllabus of English Education for Junior High School of SMP Negeri I Rambah". Pasir Pengarayan: Unpublished
- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 6th Ed). United State of America: Prentice-Hall Inc
- Grenville, Kate. 2001. *Writing from Start to Finish a Six Steps Guide*. Australia: ALLEN & UNWIN
- Hadari, Nawawi and H. M. Martini Hadari. 1991. *Instrumen Penelitian Bidang Sosial*. Pontianak: Gajah Mada University Press
- Hartono. 2004. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Pekanbaru: Pustaka Pelajar
- Hasibuan, Kalayo and Fauzan Ansari. 2007. *Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Gruba UNRI Press
- Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. United States of America: Longman Inc.
- Helly Prajitno Soetjipto and Sri Mulyantini Soetjipto (Trans) Muijs, Daniel and David Reynolds. 2008. *Effective Teaching Teori dan Aplikasi*. (2nd Ed). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Hughes, Arthur. 1989. *Testing for Language Teacher*. (2nd Ed). New York: Cambridge University Press
- Lannon, John M. 1994. *Technical Writing*. (6th Ed). University of Massachusetts Dartmouth: Harper Collins College Publisher
- Makmur, Arif Mansyur. 2009. *Tesaurus Plus Indonesia-Inggris*. Jakarta: Hikmah
- M. Syafi'i., M. Fauzan Ansari., and Jonri Kasdi. 2007. *The Effective Paragraph Development: The Process of Writing for Classroom Setting*. Pekanbaru: LBSI

- Muhaimin. 2009. *The Strategic Ways to Face English Test Kunci-Kunci Strategis Menaklukkan Segala Jenis Ujian Bahasa Inggris*. Jogjakarta: DIVA Press
- Reid, Joy. M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. United States: Prentice Hall Regents
- Richards, Jack. C and Willy A. Renandya. 2004. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. (4th Ed). United States: Cambridge University Press
- Richards, Jack. C and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (3th Ed). London: Longman Pearson Education
- Rizka, Athia. 2009. "Contribution of Collaborative Strategic Reading to Improve English Reading Comprehension". Unpublished Magister: Pekanbaru
- "Short Functional Text". 2009. 07 Mei 2011. <http://www.smpn1depok.com/media/pembelajaran/daryanto/kelas8/bahasainggris/materiI/announcement/html>.
- "Short Functional Text". 2009. 11 Mei 2011. http://www.smpn1depok.com/media/pembelajaran/daryanto/kelas8/bahasainggris/materi1/short_message.html.
- Silberman, Melvin L. (trans) Raisul Muttaqien 2009. *Active Learning 101 Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif*. (3th Ed). Bandung: Nusa Media
- Sukardi. 2003. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan Kompetensi dan Praktiknya*. Yogyakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Sutrisno Hadi. 2000. *Metodologi Research*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi
- Wikipedia. *Collaborative Learning*. The Free Encyclopedia From Wikipedia "Collaborative Learning"., the free encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collaborative_learningted to the participant. 15 July 2010
- Wina, Sanjaya. 2007. *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. (1st Ed). Bandung: Kencana Prenada Media Group
- Winker, Antoni. C and Jo Ray M.C Cuen. 1994. *Writing the Research Paper a Handbook with Both the MLA and APA Documentation Styles*. (4th Ed). Toronto: Harcourt Brace
- Yusron, Narulita. (Trans) Johnson, David. W. et al. 2010. *Collaborative Learning Strategi Pembelajaran untuk Sukses Bersama*. (1st ed). Bandung: Nusa Media

LIST OF TABLE

Table 1	The Population and the Sample of the Research	31
Table 2	The Procedure of Treatment.....	32
Table 3	ESL Composition Profile about Content.....	33
Table 4	ESL Composition Profile about Organization	33
Table 5	ESL Composition Profile about Vocabulary.....	34
Table 6	ESL Composition Profile about Language Use	35
Table 7	ESL Composition Profile about Mechanic.....	36
Table 8	Students' Writing Ability in Conventional Class (Pree test) ...	40
Table 9	Students' Writing Ability in Collaborative Class	41
Table 10	The Difference on Writing Ability of the students Both Classess	42
Table 11	Students' Writing Score in Conventional Class (Post test).....	43
Table 12	Students' Writing Score in Collaborative Class.....	44
Table 13	The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students.....	45
Table 14	The Students' Writing Ability in Conventional Class (Analysis)	
Table 15	The Students' Writing Ability Collaborative Class	44
Table 16	Mean and Standard Deviation of the Score.....	50
Table 17	The Differecne on Writing Ability of the Students (conclusion)	55